Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

JOE LEDEZMA,

Petitioner,

v.

JAMES HILL, Warden,

Respondent.

Case No. 24-cv-03393-VKD

ORDER OF TRANSFER

Joe Ledezma, a state prisoner currently confined at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego, California, filed a pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus, challenging his state conviction out of Los Angeles County. Dkt. No. 1 at 2. The Court notes that Mr. Ledezma addresses the petition to the California Court of Appeal, but the petition was mailed to this district court. Dkt. No. 1-1.1

A petition for a writ of habeas corpus made by a person in custody under the judgment and sentence of a state court of a state which contains two or more federal judicial districts may be filed in either the district of confinement or the district of conviction. See 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). Mr. Ledezma's district of confinement is the Southern District of California, which includes San Diego County. 28 U.S.C. § 84(d). However, Mr. Ledezma's district of conviction is the Western Division of the Central District, which includes Los Angeles County. 28 U.S.C. § 84(c)(2). Accordingly, the Northern District of California has no jurisdiction over this matter.

¹A search of Mr. Ledezma's name on California's Appellate Courts Case Information database shows that he also filed a state habeas petition in the 2nd Appellate District on May 31, 2024 (Case No. B338187). See https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/search.cfm?dist=2.

Case 5:24-cv-03393-VKD Document 5 Filed 06/07/24 Page 2 of 2

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25

26

27

28

United States District Court Northern District of California 1

2

3

Federal courts in California traditionally have chosen to hear habeas petitions challenging
state conviction or sentence in the district of conviction or sentencing. See Habeas L.R. 2254-
3(b)(1); Dannenberg v. Ingle, 831 F. Supp. 767, 768 (N.D. Cal. 1993); Laue v. Nelson, 279 F.
Supp. 265, 266 (N.D. Cal. 1968). Accordingly, in the exercise of its discretion and in the
furtherance of justice, the Court finds that this case should be transferred to the United States
District Court for the Western Division of the Central District of California. See 28 U.S.C.
§ 1406(a); Habeas L.R. 2254-3(b)(1).

The Clerk of the Court shall terminate all pending motions and transfer the entire file to the Western Division of the Central District of California.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 7, 2024

VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI United States Magistrate Judge

a